

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

ANIMAL CONTROL

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proposes to control nuisance animals by lethal hunting and trapping and when practical by nonlethal methods.

The Service has analyzed the following alternatives to the proposal in an Environmental Assessment (copy attached): No action; control by capture and relocation; control by use of toxic baits; control by reintroduction of natural predators.

The preferred alternative was selected over the other alternatives because: The other alternatives would either be detrimental to refuge objectives and the ecosystem or would not be compatible with the local community.

Implementation of the agency's decision would be expected to result in the following environmental, social, and economic effects: It would improve or keep the environment from degrading on the refuge. It would be popular with local hunters and trappers but unfavorable to a segment of the population who are opposed to any killing of animals on refuges by humans. It would have little economic effects. Some meat would be eaten and furs sold in a depressed fur market.

Measures to mitigate and/or minimize adverse effects have been incorporated into the proposal. These measures include: Adverse effects will only come if some form of animal control is not utilized.

The proposal is not expected to have any significant adverse effects on wetlands and floodplains, pursuant to Executive Orders 11990 and 11988 because: There is no destruction of wetland habitat or alternations to wetlands in this proposal.

The proposal has been thoroughly coordinated with all interested and/or affected parties. Parties contacted include: General public, State Clearinghouse, Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, USDA - Animal Damage Control.

Copies of the Environmental Assessment are available by writing Wapanocca NWR, P.O. Box 279, Turrell, Arkansas 72384.

Therefore, it is my determination that the proposal does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment under the meaning of section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (as amended). As such, an environmental impact statement is not required. This determination is based on the following factors (40 CFR 1508.27).

1. Both beneficial and adverse effect have been considered and this action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. (EA pages 3-7)
2. The actions will not have a significant effect on public health and safety. (EA page 6)
3. The project will not significantly effect any unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historical or cultural resources, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. EA (pages 5-6)
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. (EA pages 3,4,6)
5. The actions do not involve highly uncertain, unique, or unknown environmental risks to the human environment. (EA pages 5-6)
6. The actions will not establish and precedent for future actions with significant effects nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. (EA page 2)
7. There will be no cumulatively significant impacts on the environment. Cumulative impacts have been analyzed with consideration of other similar activities on adjacent lands, in past action, and in foreseeable future actions. (EA pages 5-6)
8. The actions will not significantly affect any site listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places, nor will they cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, of historic resources. (EA page 4)
9. The actions are not likely to adversely affect endangered or threatened species, or their habitats. (EA page 4)

10. The actions will not lead to a violation of federal, state, or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment. (EA page 2)

References: Animal Control Plan Environmental Assessment

Judy Jones 5-5-00
Regional Director Date
H. King